



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/583,520	05/31/2000	Jerry Walter Malcolm	AUS000070USI	2499
42640	7590	10/06/2004	EXAMINER	
DILLON & YUDELL LLP 8911 NORTH CAPITAL OF TEXAS HWY SUITE 2110 AUSTIN, TX 78759			BLACKWELL, JAMES H	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2176	

DATE MAILED: 10/06/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/583,520

Applicant(s)

MALCOLM, JERRY WALTER

Examiner

James H Blackwell

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 June 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 31 May 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 06/11/04.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

### DETAILED ACTION

This office action is responsive to the Amendment filed 06/11/2004.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3, 8-10, and 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maxwell et al. (hereinafter Maxwell, U.S. Patent No. 6,589,290) in view of Martino (U.S. Patent No. 6,044,382).

In regard to independent Claim 1 (and similarly independent Claims 8, and 15), Maxwell teaches that a web client is capable of obtaining forms from the Internet and contains computer code configured to allow a user to populate a form with data (Col. 9, lines 32-34; compare to Claim 1 (and similarly to Claims 8, and 15), “... **receiving, from a user by a browser application executed in a client system, data for a form in a web page**”). Maxwell fails to teach that *prior to submission of the form with the data to a server system hosting the web page, saving an address of the web page, the data provided from the user for the form, and at least one field identifier for associating the data to at least one respective field of the form into a volatile memory system of the client system*. However, Martino teaches that as an entry is made in each field, it is automatically stored within the input buffer area of the transaction buffer 97 at its assigned location and in the dictated format (Col. 20, lines 59-62. Martino does not

specifically teach storing data from web forms, it does teach storing form parameters to a memory (buffer) before execution (see Col. 20, lines 64-67; Col. 21, lines 1-2). In addition, Martino suggests that this data persists so that information is not lost due to a modem error and the like (Col. 22, lines 8-14). It would have therefore been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Maxwell and Martino because both deal with form data. Adding Martino offers the possibility of maintaining state of a form in memory rather than in the usual way for forms (such as cookies). The benefit would have been to avoid losing input data due to a communications error.

In regard to dependent Claim 2 (and similarly to dependent Claims 9, and 16), Maxwell fails to teach *in response to the user opening the browser application that had been closed and again requesting retrieval of the web page, retrieving the web page from the server system; detecting a match between the saved address and the address of the retrieved web page and, in response to detecting a match between the saved address and the address of the retrieved web page, automatically filling in the form of the web page with the data stored in the volatile memory system*). However, Martino offers scenarios where form data may be retained even after leaving a particular form for another form. For example, Martino teaches a mode where multiple transactions are collected (data from multiple forms for example) and then submitted to the server as a batch (Col. 21, lines 49-51). Another scenario would exist in the case where the user desired to go back a page (for a multi-page form) to correct a data entry (Col. 21, lines 55-67; Col. 22, lines 1-2). One could imagine that some sort of form data=value

matching could have taken place in order to repopulate a previous form allowing one to edit the information. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Maxwell and Martino because both deal with form data. The addition of Martino allows for the possibility of recalling form information previously stored in memory. The benefit would have been to avoid retyping information in a previous form.

In regard to dependent Claim 3 (and similarly dependent Claims 10, and 17), Maxwell teaches that the form completion program examines each template file in order to determine if one or more of the template files resembles the form image to within a certain threshold. If a template file that resembles the form image to within a certain threshold is located, then the form completion acknowledges that a match occurred. When a match occurs the form completion program utilizes the template file to identify what kind of data to insert into each of the form's data receptacles. For example, the template file allows the form completion program to determine which of the data receptacles contain personal information and which data receptacles contain payment information. Once the form completion program successfully identifies what kind of data to insert into each data receptacle the program begins to input the appropriate kind of data into the appropriate data receptacle (Col. 8, lines 40-55; compare to Claim 3 (and similarly Claims 10, and 17), “... **parsing, by the browser application, the data for the form; and displaying, by the browser application, the form with the data**”).

Claims 4, 11, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maxwell in view of Martino and in further view of Kikinis (U.S. Patent No. 5,794,259).

In regard to dependent Claim 4, Maxwell fails to teach *automatically filling in the form of the web page with the data only in response to the user responding with an affirmative response to a query by the browser application*. However, Kikinis teaches information such as name, address, home phone number, business phone number, facsimile number, E-Mail address, company, and so on, is stored and accessible by the control code by association with a name tag. When a user encounters a form on the Internet, and wishes to fill in the form, he/she hits a "hot key", or key combination, which invokes the control code which populates the form (Col. 3, lines 58-67; Col. 4, lines 1-4; compare to Claim 4, "... ***automatically filling in the form of the web page with the data only in response to the user responding with an affirmative response to a query by the browser application regarding whether the user wishes to fill in the form with the data saved in the volatile memory system***"). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Maxwell, Martino, and Kikinis because all three inventions deal with electronic forms. The addition of Kikinis provides the benefit of a pipeline for quickly and efficiently filling fields in forms.

In regard to dependent Claim 11 (and similarly dependent Claim 18), Maxwell fails to teach *said system further comprises means for querying, by the browser application, whether the user wishes to fill in the form using the data saved in the*

*volatile memory system in response to a match between the address of the requested web page and the address stored in the volatile memory system; said means for automatically filling comprises means for automatically filling said form only in response to the browser application receiving an indication that the user wishes to fill in the form with the data saved in the volatile memory system.* However, Kikinis teaches information such as name, address, home phone number, business phone number, facsimile number, E-Mail address, company, and so on, is stored and accessible by the control code by association with a name tag. When a user encounters a form on the Internet, and wishes to fill in the form, he/she hits a “hot key”, or key combination, which invokes the control code which populates the form (Col. 3, lines 58-67; Col. 4, lines 1-4; compare to Claim 11 (and similarly Claim 18), “... **said system further comprises means for querying, by the browser application, whether the user wishes to fill in the form using the data saved in the volatile memory system in response to a match between the address of the requested web page and the address stored in the volatile memory system; said means for automatically filling comprises means for automatically filling said form only in response to the browser application receiving an indication that the user wishes to fill in the form with the data saved in the volatile memory system**”). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Maxwell, Martino, and Kikinis because all three inventions deal with electronic forms. The addition of Kikinis provides the benefit of a pipeline for quickly and efficiently filling fields in forms.

Claims 5, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maxwell in view of Martino and in further view of Brown (hereinafter Brown, U.S. Patent No. 6,587,822).

In regard to dependent Claim 5 (and similarly dependent Claim 12), Maxwell fails to teach *determining whether the requested web page has a submittable form; and only in response to the requested web page having the submittable form, implementing, by the browser application, the receiving and saving steps*. However, Brown teaches a voice processor (114) in IVR platform (102) takes the output from the HTML parser (112) and further analyzes the corresponding retrieved HTML web page to identify structure such as, for example, section headings, tables, frames, and forms (Col. 4, lines 64-67; Col. 5, line 1; compare to Claim 5 (and similarly Claim 12), “... ***determining whether the requested web page has a submittable form; and only in response to the requested web page having the submittable form, implementing, by the browser application, the receiving and saving steps***”). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Maxwell, Martino, and Brown because all three inventions deal with the processing of forms. Adding Brown provides the benefit of identifying HTML web page structures such as forms.

Claims 6, 13, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maxwell in view of Martino and in further view of Courtner.



In regard to dependent Claim 6 (and similarly dependent Claims 13, and 20), Maxwell fails to teach *calling a clipboard operation of an operating system on which the browser application operates to save the address, the data, and the at least one field identifier into the volatile memory system*. However, Courtner teaches a Windows Clipboard that is accessible from any Windows application (including browsers). Items can be copied to, or typed into a Clipboard (pp. 38-40; compare to Claim 6 (and similarly Claims 13, and 20), “... ***calling a clipboard operation of an operating system on which the browser application operates to save the address, the data, and the at least one field identifier into the volatile memory system***”). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Maxwell, Martino, and Courtner because all three inventions deal with maintaining the state of values entered into a computer. Adding Courtner provided the benefit of a predetermined, and system wide accessible location for temporary storage for data.

Claims 7, 14, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maxwell in view of Martino.

In regard to dependent Claim 7 (and similarly dependent Claims 14, and 21), Maxwell fails to teach that *in response to the data for the form being successfully submitted to the server system and the browser application receiving a request for a next web page from the user, erasing the data from the volatile memory system*. However, Martino teaches that once the data transaction has been completed, the

contents of the transaction buffer 97 are transferred to the appropriate database servers (Col. 21, lines 37-39). In addition, if there are no more pages in the form or if the move to the next page was not successful, the end of the form is marked with a code and the transaction is saved at step 138 by transmitting the data transaction to the appropriate database server(s) 28 for storage (Col. 22, lines 2-7). Martino implies that data contained in the buffer (volatile memory) is removed (erased) once the transaction has been completed (submitted to the server). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Maxwell and Martino because both inventions deal with form data. Adding Martino provides the benefit of avoiding the population of a new form with old data.

Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maxwell in view of Martino and in further view of Kikinis and in further view of Brown.

In regard to dependent Claim 19, Maxwell fails to teach determining whether the requested web page has a submittable form; and only in response to the requested web page having the submittable form, implementing, by the browser application, the receiving and saving steps. However, Brown teaches a voice processor (114) in IVR platform (102) takes the output from the HTML parser (112) and further analyzes the corresponding retrieved HTML web page to identify structure such as, for example, section headings, tables, frames, and forms (Col. 4, lines 64-67; Col. 5, line 1; compare to Claim 19, ***“... determining whether the requested web page has a submittable form; and only in response to the requested web page having the submittable***

***form, implementing, by the browser application, the receiving and saving steps”).***

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Maxwell, Martino, Kikinis, and Brown because all four inventions deal with the processing of electronic forms. Adding Brown provides the benefit of identifying HTML web page structures such as forms.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments, see Amendment, filed 06/11/2004, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-2, 8-9, and 15-16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn.

However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Martino (U.S. Patent No. 6,044,382).

The Examiner also wishes to comment on the current breadth of the claims. Specifically, the language contained in the independent claims (1, 8, and 15) is so broad as to read on a user saving a screen dump of the form to a clipboard before sending the form to the server. For example, a user at a client computer with a web browser application requests and receives from a web server a web page containing a form. The user fills out the requested data in the form then, before submitting the form to the server for further action, performs a screen dump of the entire web browser window, saving it to the clipboard. In so doing, the user has (1) saved the address of the web page (the image of the window would contain the URL in its usual location on the

Art Unit: 2176

browser), (2) the data provided from the user for the form (the image of the browser window would contain the form and hence, its fill out contents), and (3) at least one field identifier for associating the data to at least one respective field of the form (e.g., name: you name, where "name" is the field identifier). In saving the screen dump to the clipboard, the user has saved it into a volatile memory system of the client. Additionally, the contents of the clipboard would remain even after the user quit the browser, and would be available when the user again executed the browser. Thus, the examiner suggests a narrowing of the claims to avoid such an interpretation.


***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James H Blackwell whose telephone number is 571-272-4089. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph H Feild can be reached on 571-272-4090. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

James H. Blackwell  
10/01/04

  
JOSEPH FEILD  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER